

Human Computer Interaction in Museums as Public Spaces:

A research of the Impact of Interactive
Technologies on Visitors' Experience

Alejandra Soledad Mery Keitel

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Design, Architecture and Building

University of Technology, Sydney

2012

Certificate of Authorship/Originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized capital letter 'P' followed by several loops and a long vertical stroke extending downwards.

Signature of Student

Abstract

More and more museums are incorporating interactive technologies into their exhibition environment in order to enhance their audiences' visiting experiences and satisfy their expectations. Since museums are public spaces, interactions with and within the technological environment are mainly social, many times unexpected and significantly different to those taking place in a private context. The accelerated development of technologies and their increasing availability, both for the general public and the corporative world, represent a myriad of challenges and opportunities for museums. This doctoral research investigates interrelated aspects in the domain of museum interactive exhibitions from the perspectives of the converging fields of Human Computer Interaction and Museum Studies. The research project aims to generate a comprehensive understanding of the influence that interactive technologies have on museum visitors' experiences with technologically-enhanced exhibition environments. Furthermore, given the social nature of the museum visiting experience, particular emphasis is put on the social implications of the incorporation of interactive technologies in the exhibition space.

The research approach of this project is an experience-centred field exploration informed by the development of three case studies in different exhibition settings and with different types of audiences. The purpose of the case study approach is to obtain first-hand accounts of visitors' experiences with interactive exhibits, exploring their physical, emotional and cognitive responses to these. Throughout the conduction of the case studies the work of HCI researchers John McCarthy, Peter Wright and Lisa Meekison on visitors' experiences in interactive exhibitions is used as a reflective tool. A mixed set of existing quantitative and qualitative tools is applied in each case study and new techniques are devised as the cases develop, in a responsive research approach to the existing field conditions. The exhibition settings that comprise this research project are: the *I See What You Mean* exhibition at the DAB Lab Research Gallery, the *Facets Kids* installation at the Powerhouse Museum, and the *Dangerous Australians* exhibit at the Australian Museum, all of them in Sydney, Australia.

The main outcome of this doctoral research is a referential model for the study of visitors' experiences with interactive exhibits. This model is proposed for design and museum practitioners to use as a guide in their research process for the development of new interactive exhibition environments. The conclusions of this research emphasise the need for more comprehensive understanding of visitors' experiences with technologies in the museum as a public space and the particular social interactions that occur in it.

Acknowledgements

This doctoral research project has been made possible thanks to the sponsorship of the Ministry of Education of Chile, through the Metropolitan Technological University (UTEM) and of the institution in which I conducted my post-graduate studies in Australia, the University of Technology Sydney (UTS). The Mecesup Scholarship I was awarded in 2007 allowed me to undertake my studies for three years. In 2011 the UTS Graduate School awarded me the UTS International Research Scholarship to continue and conclude my studies. I am grateful to both institutions for their financial support and their trust in my work. I am also profoundly grateful to my supervisors, Associate Professor Bert Bongers and Dr Lizzie Muller. Their passion, knowledge and guidance made this research adventure enjoyable and rewarding. I also want to thank the Faculty of Design, Architecture and Building (DAB) at UTS, for their support, encouragement and guidance. I am particularly grateful to Ann Hobson, DAB Research Manager, and Professor Peter McNeil, DAB Director of Graduate Programmes and Researcher Education, for their valuable guidance and support during my five years of research.

Many thanks to the staff and executives of the exhibition venues that welcomed my research interests and facilitated the development of my case studies. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the work, support and dedication of Aanya Roennfeldt, curator of the DAB Lab Research Gallery; Kath Daniel, Education Officer of the Powerhouse Museum's Public Programs; and Dr Lynda Kelly, Manager Online, Editing and Audience Research of the Australian Museum.

When coming to Australia I knew my life would change in many ways. I was prepared to make lots of friends, discover new places and take with me long-lasting memories. I did not expect this to start straight at my desk. Most sincere thanks to all my fellow researchers and friends at DAB who made my research voyage a unique experience of personal and professional growth. I cannot name them all, as I have been blessed with too many wonderful people to share my adventure with. However, I want to thank one person in particular, Deborah Szapiro, for being an exceptional friend and colleague, the closest to a sister I could have in Australia. My life these

years would have not been the same without her. I will miss our inspirational and re-invigorating tea sessions dearly.

Above all, my deepest thanks go to those who live in my heart the 24 hours of the day. To my informal co-supervisor Dr Natalia Romero, who would constantly give me her support, time, patience and care. Enormous thanks to Jeff Starling, for believing in me and making sure I sailed safely and happy towards my horizon. Particularly, I thank him for his fabulous stir-fry dinners and for always having 'un café' ready for my tired head. Special thanks to Jen Starling for sharing her passion for museums with me, for keeping me fascinated with museum stories, and for helping me stay healthy. Many thanks to my siblings, who were always next to me, sending me good vibes and courage. Finally, I thank my parents, Cecilia Keitel, Carlos Varas and Claudio Mery, for constantly sowing in me the seeds of knowledge and believing that I could create some on my own. To them I owe my love for culture, my passion for hard work and the conviction that we can all make the world better, one step at a time.

List of Figures

Figure 1. General view of the <i>I See What You Mean</i> exhibition space	...157
Figure 2. Examples of images collected for the content of the exhibition	...163
Figure 3. View of the exhibition from outside the gallery	...167
Figure 4. One poster of each discipline as presented in the exhibition	...168
Figure 5. The interaction table with its components distributed along it	...169
Figure 6. A visitor reading the quote presented in the main projection after approaching the interaction table	...170
Figure 7. Photo-artefact being placed on the table's interaction prompt	...171
Figure 8. Allocation of technological components of the exhibition	...172
Figure 9. Proximity sensors underneath the front edge of the interaction table	...174
Figure 10. Test screenshot of the MAX/MSP/Jitter patch of the exhibition's video projections	...175
Figure 11. Researcher's observation main spots	...179
Figure 12. Map of exhibition's Activity Zones	...181
Figure 13. Ratio of public between different Activity Zones	...182
Figure 14. Times of the day of highest gallery attendance	...183
Figure 15. Time spent by visitors in the gallery	...184
Figure 16. Trajectory Patterns as defined during the observation process	...185
Figure 17. Trajectory Map sample of three visitors	...186
Figure 18. Attention Map sample of one visitor during his whole visit	...187
Figure 19. Attention Patterns as identified during data collection	...188
Figure 20. Reasons for visitors to attend the exhibition	...194
Figure 21. Interactive components identified by visitors	...196
Figure 22. Visitors' exploration of the exhibition space	...197
Figure 23. Further thought and discussions after the exhibition visit	...198
Figure 24. General view of the <i>Facets Kids'</i> installation space	...209

Figure 25. Pico projector for mobile projections in the LightBeam project	...215
Figure 26. The CityWall display on a shop front at daylight and night time	...217
Figure 27. Trainflow installation's façade embedded with sensors	...220
Figure 28. Facets Plinth and its wide variety of interfaces	...223
Figure 29. Visitor interacting with <i>Facets Through the Roof</i>	...224
Figure 30. High audience flow in the <i>Facets Kids</i> installation area	...226
Figure 31. Researcher's observation spots	...230
Figure 32. Different audience roles in the interaction with <i>Facets Kids</i>	...235
Figure 33. Proportion of young and mature <i>Facets Kids</i> ' audience	...245
Figure 34. Interest in <i>Facets Kids</i> : active and passive engagement	...247
Figure 35. Number of passers-by effectively engaged with <i>Facets Kids</i>	...248
Figure 36. Schematic visual representations of interfaces-related movements	...251
Figure 37. Schematic visual representations of plinth-related movements	...252
Figure 38. Schematic visual representations of body-related movements	...253
Figure 39. Behaviours axis: from highly collaborative to highly conflictive	...255
Figure 40. General view of the exhibit's space	...267
Figure 41. Early interactive tabletops	...271
Figure 42. The reacTable and its varied-patterns objects	...275
Figure 43. Attendees to the Geneva Motor Show 2009 interact with a multi-touch interactive tabletop	...278
Figure 44. Attendees to the Entrepreneur of the Year Awards interacting with one of The Pod's sectors. Image courtesy of Elisa Lee	...279
Figure 45. The Locations exhibit at the ACMI's Screen Worlds exhibition	...280
Figure 46. Projectors and speakers of the Churchill Lifeline tabletop	...281
Figure 47. The Star-Spangled Banner exhibit	...282
Figure 48. The <i>Dangerous Australians</i> exhibit within the <i>Surviving Australia</i> exhibition. Adapted from the Australian Museum's exhibition floorplan	...285
Figure 49. The 'Island Homes' section of the <i>Surviving Australia</i> Exhibition	...286
Figure 50. One of the accesses to the <i>Dangerous Australians</i> exhibit	...287

Figure 51. Representation of the <i>Dangerous Australians</i> tabletop's content	...288
Figure 52. Three stages in the presentation of pop-up information graphics	...289
Figure 53. Part of the <i>Dangerous Australians</i> ' camera vision system	...290
Figure 54. Blank form for the recording of visitors' trajectories	...296
Figure 55. Proportion of young and mature audiences	...300
Figure 56. Breakdown of specific age groups attending the exhibit	...301
Figure 57. Levels of Interaction observed at the exhibit	...302
Figure 58. Segmentation of interaction time periods	...304
Figure 59. Six of the most recurrent trajectories patterns identified	...305
Figure 60. A 'Random with Repetition' trajectory of two participants	...306
Figure 61. Breakdown of trajectories patterns according to the influence of space and content	...307
Figure 62. Time given by visitors to each of the tabletop's features	...308
Figure 63. Attention patterns depicting visitors' features preferences	...309
Figure 64. A sequence showing different uses of fingers in the interaction with <i>Dangerous Australians</i>	...311
Figure 65. A participant hovering his left hand above the surface	...312
Figure 66. Participants interacting while standing straight, bending over the surface and leaning on it	...312
Figure 67. A visitor looks at the tabletop's content from a short distance and approaches gradually to interact	...313
Figure 68. Children frequently observed sitting or standing on the tabletop	...314
Figure 69. A young and short participant trying to reach the surface	...315
Figure 70. Children rising up on their toes to reaching some features	...315
Figure 71. Most social interactions reflected a sense of collaboration	...319
Figure 72. Social behaviour throughout the development of the study	...319
Figure 73. A girl is encouraged by her parents to explore and explain; shortly after they explore together	...320
Figure 74. Participants from different visiting groups engage in a game	...320

Figure 75. Drawbacks of darkness in the exhibit area	...324
Figure 76. The <i>Dangerous Australians</i> exhibit as seen by visitors when passing by	...325
Figure 77. Two series of images depicting audience's responses	...326
Figure 78. Left: a participant touches the correct action button to close the pop-up graphic. Right: two participants bang with their fists on a non-interactive video section.	...328
Figure 79. Referential model for the study of social experiences with interactive museum exhibits	...346

List of Tables

Table 1. Observations general records	...180
Table 2. Record of presence of public in the different Activity Zones	...182
Table 3. A 5-point scale that categorises the different levels of attention to Interactive Sets	...190
Table 4. Creation of Engagement Levels scale from Attention Levels scale	...191
Table 5. Bodily and facial expressions observed during the study	...192
Table 6. Case study's general records	...234
Table 7. Demographic records	...246
Table 8. Participants' physical behaviours in the interaction with <i>Facets Kids</i>	...250
Table 9. Categorisation of participants' and group members' social behaviours	...254
Table 10. Case Study's summarised records	...299
Table 11. Social Behaviours at <i>Dangerous Australians</i> explained	...317

List of Appendices

Appendix 1. Case Study: <i>I See What You Mean</i> . Exhibition fact sheet	...383
Appendix 2. Case Study: <i>I See What You Mean</i> . UTS HREC Ethics Approval Letter	...384
Appendix 3. Case Study: <i>I See What You Mean</i> . Promotional flyer of the exhibition sent by the Gallery	...385
Appendix 4. Case Study: <i>I See What You Mean</i> . Email sent to random participants inviting them to answer the exhibition's web-based anonymous survey	...386
Appendix 5. Case Study: <i>I See What You Mean</i> . Screenshot of the web-based anonymous survey	...388
Appendix 6. Case Study: <i>Facets Kids</i> . Installation fact sheet	...393
Appendix 7. Case Study: <i>Facets Kids</i> . Powerhouse Museum Floorplan, Level 1, with the orange section indicating the area in which the installation was presented	...394
Appendix 8. Case Study: <i>Facets Kids</i> . Draft for the design of units of study made during the first day of fieldwork	...395
Appendix 9. Case Study: <i>Facets Kids</i> . Field notes and sketches for the unit of study Movement Patterns	...396
Appendix 10. Case Study: <i>Facets Kids</i> . Field data collection sample of the unit of study Audience Participation	...397
Appendix 11. Case Study: <i>Facets Kids</i> . Schematic representation of the distribution of technology in the installation	...398
Appendix 12. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i> . Exhibit fact sheet	...399
Appendix 13. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i> . UTS HREC Ethics Approval Letter	...400
Appendix 14. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i> . UTS HREC Working with children regulatory paperwork	...401
Appendix 15. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i> . <i>Surviving Australia</i> Exhibition Floorplan, with the red circle indicating the area in which the exhibit is located	...404

Appendix 16. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i> . Research Information Form presented to participants	...405
Appendix 17. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i> . Consent forms for different audiences: adults, teenagers (accompanied by adults), children (accompanied by adults), and parents accompanying teenagers and/or children	...406
Appendix 18. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i> . Semi-structured interviews questions samples for interviews with museum experts and with design experts	...410

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	23
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	25
1.1. Outline of the Research Problem.....	27
1.2. Research Questions.....	29
1.3. Research Approach	31
1.4. Research Contributions	32
1.5. Structure of the Thesis.....	32
Chapter 2. Experiencing Interactive Technologies.....	32
Chapter 3. The Shaping World of the Museum	33
Chapter 4. Interacting with Technologies at the Museum.....	33
Chapter 5. Methodology.....	33
Chapters 6, 7 and 8. Case Studies.....	33
Chapter 9. Research Contribution and Conclusions	34
Chapter 2. Experiencing Interactive Technologies	35
2.1. The Relationship between Humans and Computers.....	37
2.1.1. Designing for Interactions	39
2.1.2. The Lively World of Interactivity.....	43
2.1.3. Facing Interactions.....	47
2.2. Experiencing the Interactive World	48
2.2.1. Academic Discussions around Experience.....	51
2.2.2. A Breaking-Down of Experience	54
2.3. Interactive Experiences in Public Spaces	58
2.3.1. Engaging in Public.....	61
2.3.2. Social Exchange of Experiences.....	63
2.4. Summary	65
Chapter 3. The Shaping World of the Museum	67
3.1. A Museum Definition	69
3.1.1. From Cabinets of Curiosity to Engaging Experiences	71
3.1.2. A New Museum, New Challenges	74

3.2.	The Museum Audience.....	76
3.2.1.	Overview of Museum Attendance.....	78
3.2.2.	Factors Influencing Visitors' Attendance	80
3.2.3.	What Visitors Expect and What They Do	81
3.3.	The Museum Space.....	83
3.3.1.	The Material of Stories	83
3.3.2.	Communicating Through Displays.....	86
3.3.3.	Displayed and Spatial Narratives.....	87
3.3.4.	Space in Narrative.....	88
3.4.	The Museum Message	91
3.4.1.	Construction of Meaning	91
3.4.2.	Learning at the Museum	92
3.4.3.	Learning is a Social Experience.....	95
3.5.	Summary.....	97
Chapter 4.	Interacting with Technologies at the Museum	99
4.1.	Interaction in the Museum.....	101
4.1.1.	Experience Context of the Museum.....	101
4.1.2.	Being Immersed in the Museum	102
4.1.3.	Sensing the Museum	104
4.1.4.	Engagement at the Museum	106
4.2.	Technologies in the Exhibition Environment.....	108
4.2.1.	Multimedia and Interactive Technologies in the Museum	111
4.2.2.	The Technological Exhibition Landscape	112
4.2.3.	Some Considerations for the Design of Interactive Exhibitions.....	116
4.3.	Understanding Visitors' Response to Interactive Exhibitions.....	119
4.3.1.	The Matter of Evaluation.....	120
4.3.2.	The Approaches and Structures of Evaluation.....	122
	Front-End Evaluation	123
	Formative Evaluation.....	123
	Remedial Evaluation.....	124
	Summative Evaluation.....	124

4.4. Summary	126
Chapter 5. Methodology	129
5.1. Introduction	131
5.2. Understanding Experience: A Research Approach	132
5.2.1. Four Threads of Experience	133
5.2.2. Sense-Making in Experience	134
5.3. Primary Research Methodology	135
A Case Study Approach.....	136
5.4. Research Methods.....	137
5.4.1. A Field of Possibilities	137
5.4.2. Gathering Data	139
Observing Visitors.....	141
Listening to Visitors.....	143
Later Feedback.....	145
Asking the Experts.....	146
5.5. A Correct Pathway.....	147
5.5.1. Ethical Considerations.....	147
5.5.2. Reliability and Validity	149
5.6. Developing the Case Studies	150
5.6.1. The Chronology.....	150
5.6.2. The Variety	151
5.6.3. The Presentation.....	153
Chapter 6. Case Study: <i>I See What You Mean</i>	155
6.1. Introduction to the Exhibition and Case Study	157
6.2. Exhibition's Creators and their Collaboration.....	158
6.3. Theoretical Background of the Exhibition	160
6.4. The Design Process of <i>I See What You Mean</i>	161
6.4.1. Conceptual Design.....	161
6.4.2. The Exhibition Design	164
6.4.3. The Exhibition Components.....	167
6.4.4. The Technology Behind the Exhibition.....	171

6.4.5.	The Visiting Experience.....	175
6.5.	Methods Used in the Case Study.....	177
6.6.	Case Study Data Overview.....	180
6.6.1.	Observation Data.....	180
6.6.2.	Survey Data	193
6.7.	What <i>I See What You Mean</i> Meant: Findings.....	200
	Summary of Key Findings from the I See What You Mean Case Study.....	204
Chapter 7.	Case Study: <i>Facets Kids</i>	207
7.1.	Introduction to the Installation and Case Study.....	209
7.2.	Bert Bongers: Interactivating the World.....	210
7.3.	Background of the Installation	212
7.3.1.	Researching and Designing for Interactivity.....	212
7.3.2.	Interactive Displays and Public: Related Work	214
7.3.3.	The Work Leading to <i>Facets Kids</i>	218
7.3.4.	The Facets Projects.....	220
7.4.	<i>Facets Kids</i>	225
7.5.	Methods Used in the Case Study.....	228
7.5.1.	Audience Response to <i>Facets Kids</i>	231
7.5.2.	Demographic Study.....	232
7.5.3.	Audience Participation	232
7.5.4.	Movement Patterns	233
7.5.5.	Social Interactions	233
7.6.	Case Study Data Overview.....	233
7.6.1.	Audience Response: Phenomena, Trends and other Remarks	234
7.6.2.	Audience Response: Semi-structured Interviews	240
7.6.3.	Demographic Study.....	244
7.6.4.	Audience Participation	246
7.6.5.	Movement Patterns	249
7.6.6.	Social Interactions	253
7.7.	The Many Facets of <i>Facets Kids</i> : Findings	256
	Summary of Key Findings from the Facets Kids Case Study.....	261

Chapter 8. Case Study: <i>Dangerous Australians</i>	265
8.1. Introduction to the Exhibit.....	267
8.2. Background of the Exhibit.....	269
8.2.1. The Development of Interactive Tabletops.....	269
Image Display	271
User Input and Interaction.....	272
Tracking and Identification	274
From Prototypes to Products	276
8.2.2. Public Around the Table: Related Work.....	277
MultiTouch to the Public	278
The Pod.....	279
Locations.....	280
Churchill Lifeline.....	281
Star-Spangled Banner	282
8.2.3. <i>Surviving Australia</i> Exhibition.....	283
8.3. <i>Dangerous Australians</i>	286
8.3.1. Exhibit's Description	287
8.3.2. The Visiting Experience	290
8.4. Methods Used in the Case Study	292
8.4.1. Age Groups Study.....	294
8.4.2. Stages of Interaction	295
8.4.3. Interaction Time	295
8.4.4. Trajectories.....	296
8.4.5. Attention Time	296
8.4.6. Bodily Gestures.....	297
8.4.7. Social Interactions.....	297
8.4.8. Audience Response to <i>Dangerous Australians</i>	298
8.5. Case Study Data Overview	298
8.5.1. Age Groups Study.....	299
8.5.2. Stages of Interaction	301
8.5.3. Interaction Time	302

8.5.4.	Trajectories	304
8.5.5.	Attention Time.....	307
8.5.6.	Bodily Gestures	310
8.5.7.	Social Interactions	316
8.5.8.	Audience Response to <i>Dangerous Australians</i>	321
8.6.	The Voice of the Creatures: Case Study Findings	330
	Summary of Key Findings from the Dangerous Australians Case Study.....	335
Chapter 9. Research Contribution and Conclusions		339
9.1.	Overview of the Research Problem	341
9.2.	Referential Model for the Study of Visitors' Experiences with Interactive Exhibits	343
9.3.	A Retrospective Application of the Referential Model.....	347
9.4.	Conclusions	353
9.5.	Future Work.....	358
References.....		361
Appendices		381

Foreword

My academic background is in Industrial Design and I hold a permanent contract position as lecturer and researcher in the School of Design at the Metropolitan Technological University (UTEM) Chile, lecturing in Semiotics, Design Fundamentals and Interaction Design. In 2008 I was awarded a competitive Mecesup Scholarship extended by the Chilean Ministry of Education to undertake doctoral research in the field of Human Computer Interaction.

As an active member of UTEM's research centre ProteinLab (UTEM's Prospective and Technological Innovation Program) I became interested in interactive technologies and engaged in research projects that explored these applied in areas as varied as mobile communications, marketing, distributed workspaces and domestic environments. Through this research I was able to observe the interaction between users and technologies in public spaces and identify that this particular context affected both the physical dynamics and the social behaviours. I saw in the conduction of post graduate research the opportunity to research a topic I felt warranted closer attention. Consequently, my research topic explores the interaction resulting of the relationship between public spaces, their users and supporting technologies.

Cultural heritage institutions such as museums are my particular area of interest. In the time it has taken to develop this doctoral research I have been able to analyse how progressively museums are integrating new technologies in their exhibitions, as a way of enhancing visitors' experience. Within this context I have observed several gaps between the intended purpose of the exhibits and spaces and the expectations and actual experiences of their visitors. My research premise is that museums may find in new technologies a useful tool for the fulfilment of visitors' new demands if these are addressed understanding visitors' needs and expectations in a more comprehensive way.

Museums are places in which the study of both social and technology-aided interactions take place in a natural and reliable environment, as opposed to a controlled laboratory research setting. Museums provide the potential for insight into visitors' encounters, explorations and

discoveries within their visiting experience. An integrating research approach centred on the conveyance of meaning through social interactions comes into sight as the most consistent approach for the future design of meaningful and engaging visiting experiences.